

REMARKS

Applicant cancels claims 18-41 without prejudice or disclaimer; therefore, claims 1-17 and 42-45 are now pending in this application.

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Baba in view Suzuki et al. (Suzuki). Claims 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly claiming an intermediate product. Claims 4 and 9-14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim.

Applicant thanks Examiner Coleman for conducting a very productive personal interview with the Applicant's representative on September 9, 2003.

As a summary of the substance of the interview, Applicant submits the following.

The Examiner's Interview Summary accurately summarizes the discussion held during the interview. Applicant also notes, that in addition to the agreement reached with the Examiner as to the Baba reference, the Examiner and Applicant's representative agreed to clarifying amendments to claim 1, as presented above. As noted during the interview, these amendments do not narrow the scope of claim 1, but are merely clarifying amendments. No estoppel is created.

As agreed during the interview, element 9 of the Baba reference is a "line" which does not at all correspond to, and does not teach or suggest, a metal pad of Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, as agreed during the interview, Baba and Suzuki do not teach or suggest semiconductor package boards having unique combinations of features as recited in Applicant's independent claims 1 and 45. Accordingly, Applicant's independent claims 1 and 45, as well as

the dependent claims 2, 3, 5-8, 15-17, 42 and 43 (which incorporate all the novel and unobvious features of their base claim 1), would not have been obvious from any reasonable combination of Baba and Suzuki.

With regard to the §101 rejection of claims 42 and 43, Applicant has amended these claims to even more clearly recite the features of these particular implementations of the embodiments of Applicant's invention. These amendments are clarifying amendments and as such do not narrow the scope of the original claims 42 and 43. Applicant respectfully submits that the structures recited in these claims are not intermediate products as explained with reference to the exemplary, non-limiting implementation shown in Applicant's Fig. 1C and described on page 12, lines 6-12 of Applicant's specification. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §101 rejection.

Finally, as a formal matter, Applicant notes that the Japanese Patent No. 2679681 submitted with the IDS filed September 7, 2001 has not yet been considered, allegedly because the concise explanation requirement has not been met for this Japanese language reference. However, as explained in Applicant's previous amendment, filed March 27, 2003, and as noted in the IDS Submission dated September 7, 2001, this reference corresponds to Japanese Laid-Open Patent Application No. 8-306820 for which an English language Abstract has been provided with the September 7, 2001 submission. Furthermore, with regard to the IDS filed February 12, 2003, as noted in the IDS, Applicant has met the concise explanation requirement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(3) by providing a copy of the Japanese Office Action dated January 14, 2003 with an English language translation of the pertinent portions thereof which cite such

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114
U.S. Appln No. 09/894,123

Atty Dkt No. Q65269

documents and indicate the degree of relevance found by the foreign patent office (see MPEP 609 (III)(A(3)). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider these references, and to return initialed Forms PTO-1449 accordingly.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Stan Torgovitsky
Registration No. 43,958

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: December 1, 2003